U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2005-002-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC68227

PROJECT NAME: Rio Blanco Hill Communication Site and Access Road

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado
T. 4 S., R. 94 W.,
Sec. 9, SW¼NW¼, W½SW¼;
Sec. 16, W½NW¼, NE¼SW¼;
Sec. 17, NE¼NE¼.

APPLICANT: Union Telephone Company

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional): None

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: Union Telephone Company has applied for the use of an existing access road and for the installation of a cellular installation on Rio Blanco Hill.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a cellular facility to be located on Rio Blanco Hill. There is an existing access road that comes from private property onto public lands. The length of the access road on public land is 8,040 feet with a width of 16 feet encompassing 2.95 acres, more or less. The site itself will be 50 feet by 50 feet (0.06 acres).

Earth-moving equipment will be used to dig the foundation for the tower foundation. The proposed height of the tower is 30 feet. The tower foundation will be approximately 13 foot square by 5 feet deep. The tower will be a lattice type structure and will be constructed on-site. The interior of the building will have lighting; however, there will be no security lighting of the facilities. Two foundation trenches approximately 2 feet by 8 feet long are also dug to form concrete beams to support each of the two fiberglass buildings. The pre-fabricated equipment building will be 8’ x 16’ x 8’ high. The pre-fabricated generator building will be 8’ x 12’ x 8’. All hauling of materials including concrete, will be done utilizing existing roads and no addition road building or clearing is necessary. There is existing power at the site.

The construction crew necessary for this work will never exceed five to eight men on the job at any one time. No worker camps will be necessary.

This action will be authorized under Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. A term of 30 years has been requested.

No Action Alternative: Under the no action alternative, the application would be denied and a different site would have to be found.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD: None

NEED FOR THE ACTION: An application for a right-of-way has been filed requesting a communication site and access road.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: Pages 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: "To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of other resource values."

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements listed below:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS

AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment: The entire White River Resource Area has been designated as either attainment or unclassified for all pollutants, and most of the area has been designated prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) class II.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would result in short term, local impacts to air quality during construction, from fugitive dust being blown into the air.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Under the no action alternative, there would be no adverse affects on air quality.

Mitigation: Require dust abatement measures in the authorizing document.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed cellular telephone tower appears to be located in a place that has been inventoried at the Class III (100% pedestrian) level (McDonald and Metcalf 1994, Compliance Dated 11/14/1994, Jennings 1976, Compliance Dated 3/16/1976) with no new cultural resources located in the area by either inventory.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It does not appear that the proposed action will impact any known cultural resources.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to cultural resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator

will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES

Affected Environment: Noxious weeds of concern in this area include; houndstongue, bull thistle, musk thistle, spotted knapweed and yellow toadflax. On this site yellow toadflax is currently being treated by the BLM and grazing permittee.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Yellow toadflax is on site and is expected to take advantage of the disturbed soils created by the installation of the tower. There is the opportunity for the construction equipment to transport in noxious weed species, and more importantly to transport toadflax to other sites. With the mitigation prescribed below the transport of yellow toadflax off-site would be minimized. Important to the prevention of invasion of noxious weeds is the establishment of perennial vegetation. With reclamation using the recommended seed mix the opportunity for noxious weed dominance is decreased. The seed mix does not contain any non-native species.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no adverse impacts.

Mitigation: 1. All of the equipment including support vehicles would be cleaned on site before leaving. The minimum standard would be to brush all soil material from equipment before leaving the site. If construction occurs when muddy conditions are present the equipment is to be pressure washed on site.

2. Use seed that is certified and free of noxious weeds. Seed certification tags must be submitted to the Area Manager.

3. Additional seed applications may be required to accommodate specific site conditions or if initial seed germination has failed.

4. Seed species used in reseeding disturbed areas will be based on the seed mixes identified in table B1 and B2. These mixes are based on range sites as determined by soils.

Table B-2. Native Seed Mixes

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Range Sites
6	Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar)	2	Alpine Meadow, Alpine Slopes, Aspen

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Range Sites
	Slender wheatgrass (Primar) Big bluegrass (Sherman) Canby bluegrass (Canbar) Mountain brome (Bromar)	2 1 1 2	Woodlands, Brushy Loam, Deep Clay Loam, Douglas-fir Woodland, Loamy Park, Mountain Loam, Mountain Meadows, Mountain Swale, Shallow Subalpine, Spruce-fir Woodland, Subalpine Loam

5. Leave the disturbed area in a condition that provides drainage with no additional maintenance.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The proposed action is largely encompassed by ridgeline mountain shrub communities composed of mixed bitterbrush, serviceberry, snowberry, and mountain big sagebrush. Stands of aspen and Douglas-fir occupy several of the draws along the access route and the proposed facility is situated above a small 5-acre stand of aspen. Virginia's warbler and green-tailed towhee (shrubland sites) and broad-tailed hummingbird, violet-green swallow and red-naped sapsucker (aspen sites), are birds of higher conservation interest (i.e., Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory Partners-in-Flight program) that are represented at appropriate densities and fulfill nesting functions in these habitats from May through July. There are no narrowly specialized or endemic species associated with this area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It is likely that site construction would occur in the later spring months and would likely coincide with migratory bird breeding activities. Project access and siting along an existing road would represent a recurrent, but brief and low intensity form of disturbance that would not be expected to disrupt nesting activities of migratory birds in adjacent shrubland or woodland habitats. Facility construction, being confined to $1/20^{th}$ of an acre on the road margin, too, does not represent a form of disturbance that would be expected to disrupt nesting activities beyond the immediate project site (less than 1 acre). The probability of facility construction disrupting a nest attempt, particularly for cavity dwelling forest associates (i.e., as long as trees are not directly involved during site clearing), would be very low and in the worst case would likely be limited to no more than one nest of a species of lower conservation interest.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would have potential to disrupt migratory bird breeding activity.

Mitigation: Final facility siting will avoid the involvement or clearing of any aspen or Douglas-fir growth (including regeneration).

THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE ANIMAL SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)

Affected Environment: There are no animals listed under the Endangered Species Act or BLM's sensitive species list that inhabit or derive important benefit from the project locale.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on individuals of, or habitat associated with, special status species.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would have potential to influence special status animals.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The proposed and no-action alternatives have no conceivable potential to influence populations of, or habitats associated with, special status animals and, as such, they would have no influence on the status of applicable land health standards.

WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: There are no known hazardous or other solid wastes on the subject lands. No hazardous materials are known to have been used, stored or disposed of at sites included in the project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: No listed or extremely hazardous materials in excess of threshold quantities are proposed for use in this project. While commercial preparations of fuels and lubricants proposed for use may contain some hazardous constituents, they would be stored, used and transported in a manner consistent with applicable laws, and the generation of hazardous wastes would not be anticipated. Solid wastes would be properly disposed of.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no-action alternative.

Mitigation: The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)

Affected Environment: The proposed action is in Piceance Creek which is identified in segment 14; the mainstem of Piceance Creek form the source to Emily Oldland diversion dam.

A review of the Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, the 303(d) list and the Unified Watershed Assessment was done to see if any water quality concerns have been identified. All actions are within the White River watershed. The State has classified this stream segment Cold Aquatic Life 1, Recreation 1b, and Agriculture. The state has further defined water quality parameters with table values. These standards reflect the ambient water quality and define maximum allowable concentrations for the various water quality parameters. The anti-degradation rule applies to this segment meaning no further water

quality degradation is allowable that would interfere with or become harmful to the designated uses.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: As with any surface disturbing activity, there could be short term impacts affecting water quality of Piceance Creek. These impacts would be a possible increase of sedimentation to Piceance Creek during the construction phase of the project. These impacts would be short term until successful re-vegetation has occurred.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Impacts from the no action alternative are not anticipated.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: Currently the water quality of this segment of Piceance Creek meets the State standards and will continue to do so with the implementation of the proposed action.

WETLANDS AND RIPARIAN ZONES (includes a finding on Standard 2)

Affected Environment: There are no BLM-administered riparian or wetland communities that would be directly or indirectly involved with this action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on the condition or function of riparian or wetland communities.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would have potential to influence riparian or wetland communities.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: The proposed and no-action alternatives have no conceivable potential to directly or indirectly affect the function or character of riparian or wetland communities and, as such, they would have no influence on the status of applicable land health standards.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, or Wild and Scenic Rivers, threatened, endangered or sensitive plants exist within the area affected by the proposed action. For threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species Public Land Health Standard is not applicable since neither the proposed nor the no-action alternative would have any influence on populations of, or habitats potentially occupied by, special status plants. There are also no Native American religious or environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action.

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS

The following elements **must** be addressed due to the involvement of Standards for Public Land Health:

SOILS (includes a finding on Standard 1)

Affected Environment: The proposed action is soil mapping unit #43; Irigul-Parachute complex, on 5 to 30 percent slopes. This map unit is on ridges and mountainsides. Areas are irregular in shape and are 20 to 250 acres in size. The native vegetation is mainly grasses and shrubs. Elevation is 7,600 to 8,500 feet. The average annual precipitation is 18 to 22 inches, the average annual air temperature is 37 to 39 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is 45 to 75 days.

This unit is 60 percent Irigul channery loam and 30 percent Parachute loam. The Irigul soil is mainly in convex areas, and the Parachute soil is in slightly concave areas. The components of this unit are so intricately intermingled that it was not practical to map them separately at the scale used.

The Irigul soil is shallow and well drained. It formed in residuum derived from sandstone and hard shale. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown channery loam 5 inches thick. The underlying material is brown extremely channery loam 7 inches thick. Hard sandstone is at a depth of 12 inches. Depth to hard sandstone or shale is 10 to 20 inches. Permeability of the Irigul soil is moderate. Available water capacity is very low. Effective rooting depth is 10 to 20 inches. Runoff is medium to rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is very high.

The Parachute soil is moderately deep and well drained. It formed in residuum derived dominantly from sandstone. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown loam 4 inches thick. The upper 20 inches of the subsoil is grayish brown loam channery loam, and the lower 8 inches is pale brown extremely channery sandy loam 6 inches thick. Sandstone is at a depth of 38 inches. Depth to sandstone or shale ranges from 20 to 40 inches. Permeability of the Parachute soil is moderate. Available water capacity is low. Effective rooting depth is 20 to 40 inches. Runoff is medium, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate to very high.

The Irigul soil is in Loamy Slopes range site, and the Parachute soil is in Mountain Loam range site.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: As with any surface disturbing activity, there will be short term impacts to soil resources, such as soil compaction, soil erosion, and wind exposure. These impacts would be short term until successful re-vegetation has occurred.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Impacts from the no action alternative are not anticipated.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: Currently the soils meet the State standards and will continue to do so with the implementation of the proposed action.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The project site is disturbed vegetation within a mountain shrub association. The climax vegetation is oakbrush, serviceberry, snowberry and a variety of forbs and shrubs. This is a productive site and is expected to reclaim easily.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There would be disturbance of vegetation on site. With reclamation as contained in the Noxious-Non-Native species section there are not expected to any adverse impacts.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no adverse impacts.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial)*:* Following reclamation this site would meet the Public Land Health Standard for plant communities.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: There are no BLM-administered channel systems or associated aquatic habitats that would be directly or indirectly involved with this action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on the condition or function of aquatic habitats.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would have potential to influence aquatic habitats.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: The proposed and no-action alternatives have no conceivable potential to directly or indirectly affect the function or character of aquatic habitats and, as such, they would have no influence on the status of applicable land health standards.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The project area is situated on a relatively high-elevation (8400') ridgeline composed of aspen and douglas-fir stands interspersed in a mountain shrub matrix. This BLM parcel is land-locked with the existing and proposed access road controlled at either end by private land. This area is used primarily by deer and elk as summer range with an occupation period extending principally from May through November.
Although aspen and Douglas-fir stands are favored nest sites for red-tailed, sharp-shinned, and Cooper's hawks, there is no reasonable likelihood that a nest would be located in close proximity to the margin of the adjacent forest stand along the existing road.
Other small mammals and birds using this area are typical and widely distributed in extensive like habitats across the Resource Area and northwest Colorado; there are no narrowly endemic or highly specialized species known to inhabit those lands potentially influenced by this action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Surface disturbance and disruptive activity attributable to this action would be short term, diminutive, and would occur along an existing road corridor. Maintenance activity would be occasional and sporadic and, on this privately controlled road, an incidental source of disturbance. Proposed facility installation and operation would have no conceivable influence on habitat utility or the availability of forage or cover for big game or nongame species at any resource scale.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would have potential to influence terrestrial animal populations or associated habitats.

Mitigation: see migratory bird section

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The lands surrounding the proposed facility site currently meet the Land Health Standards for terrestrial wildlife. Installation and long term occupation of the proposed site would have no short or long-term influence on terrestrial wildlife populations or associated habitats and therefore would not interfere with continued meeting of the standard. The no-action alternative would similarly have no influence on continued meeting of the standard.

OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS: For the following elements, only those brought forward for analysis will be addressed further.

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Access and Transportation		X	
Cadastral Survey	X		
Fire Management	X		
Forest Management	X		

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Geology and Minerals	X		
Hydrology/Water Rights	X		
Law Enforcement		X	
Noise			
Paleontology			X
Rangeland Management		X	
Realty Authorizations		X	
Recreation		X	
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources			X
Wild Horses	X		

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed cellular tower site is located in an area mapped as the Douglas Creek Member of the Green River Formation which the BLM has categorized as a Condition II formation meaning that its fossil bearing potential is not clearly understood in the area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There is an unknown potential to impact fossil resources during excavations for the proposed tower and related facilities.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to fossil resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: If it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock in order to construct the footer/foundation for the tower or the supporting facilities a monitor shall be permitted to spot check the excavations for fossils.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located within a VRM class III area. The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would be located near the top of a ridge approximately one mile from SH 13, which is the route that would most likely be traveled by a casual observer. The proposed action would not be visible from SH 13, since the highway is located in a valley. A brief glimpse of the structure would be visible

occasionally to seasonal hunters traveling some of the 4 wheel drive roads in the vicinity. Access to the proposed action would be through private land. Since the communication structure is only 30 feet tall and would be located with a backdrop of pinyon/juniper trees, the antennae should not attract the attention of a casual observer, and certainly should not dominate the view. By painting the structure Juniper Green to blend with the background, the level of change to the characteristic landscape would be low, and the objectives of the VRM III classification would be retained.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no additional environmental consequences.

Mitigation: Paint all facilities and structures Juniper Green.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: This action is consistent with the scope of impacts addressed in the White River ROD/RMP. The cumulative impacts of these activities are addressed in the White River ROD/RMP for each resource value that would be affected by the proposed action.

REFERENCES CITED

Jennings, Calvin H.
1976 Archaeological survey of Two Television Translator Sites in Rio Blanco County, Colorado. Laboratory of Public Archaeology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

McDonald, Kae, and Michael D. Metcalf
1994 Questar M. L. 68 Replacement Pipeline, A Class III Cultural Resource Inventory in Garfield and Rio Blanco Counties, Colorado. Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc, Eagle, Colorado.

Tweto, Ogden
1979 Geologic Map of Colorado. United States Geologic Survey, Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED: None

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Carol Hollowed	Hydrologist	Air Quality
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Threatened and Endangered Plant Species
Michael Selle	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources Paleontological Resources
Robert Fowler	Forester	Invasive, Non-Native Species
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Bo Brown	Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Carol Hollowed	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Carol Hollowed	Hydrologist	Soils
Robert Fowler	Forester	Vegetation
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	Natural Resource Specialist	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Robert Fowler	Forester	Rangeland Management
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Keith Whitaker	Natural Resource Specialist	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	Natural Resource Specialist	Wild Horses

Finding of No Significant Impact/Decision Record (FONSI/DR)

CO-110-2005-002-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)/RATIONALE: The environmental assessment and analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed action have been reviewed. The approved mitigation measures (listed below) result in a Finding of No Significant Impact on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary to further analyze the environmental effects of the proposed action.

DECISION/RATIONALE: It is my decision to approve the proposed action with the mitigation measures listed below.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

1. The holder will be required to provide dust abatement measures as directed by the authorized officer.

2. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

3. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

4. All of the equipment including support vehicles would be cleaned on site before leaving. The minimum standard would be to brush all soil material from equipment before leaving the site. If construction occurs when muddy conditions are present the equipment is to be pressure washed on site.

5. Use seed that is certified and free of noxious weeds. Seed certification tags must be submitted to the Field Manager.

6. Additional seed applications may be required to accommodate specific site conditions or if initial seed germination has failed.

7. Seed species used in reseeding disturbed areas will be based on the seed mixes identified in table B1 and B2. These mixes are based on range sites as determined by soils.

Table B-2. Native Seed Mixes

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Range Sites
6	Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar) Slender wheatgrass (Primar) Big bluegrass (Sherman) Canby bluegrass (Canbar) Mountain brome (Bromar)	2 2 1 1 2	Alpine Meadow, Alpine Slopes, Aspen Woodlands, Brushy Loam, Deep Clay Loam, Douglas-fir Woodland, Loamy Park, Mountain Loam, Mountain Meadows, Mountain Swale, Shallow Subalpine, Spruce-fir Woodland, Subalpine Loam

8. Leave the disturbed area in a condition that provides drainage with no additional maintenance.

9. Final facility siting will avoid the involvement or clearing of any aspen or Douglas-fir growth, including regeneration.

10. If it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock in order to construct the footer/foundation for the tower or the supporting facilities a monitor shall be permitted to spot check the excavations for fossils.

11. All above ground facilities will be painted Juniper Green.

12. The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed action.

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING: Compliance will be conducted by the realty staff every five years.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Caroline Hollowed

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: Kent C. Walter
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 12/17/04

ATTACHMENTS: Location map of the proposed action.

Location of Proposed Action
CO-110-2005-002-EA